

REMARKS

Claims 11-16, 32-37, and 40-45 are pending. In an Official Action dated Feb. 8, 2008, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The claims are variously amended and clarifications are provided below to address the outstanding amendments.

Applicants thank the examiner for the telephonic interview of June 13, 2008. The examiner indicated that amending paragraph [0014] of the specification to include the phrase “computer readable medium” would not constitute adding new matter to the specification and that doing so would overcome the present objection to the specification. Applicant agreed to amend claim 11 to clarify the techniques used. The examiner further indicated that the proposed amendment to claim 32 (incorporated into the present reply) would overcome the 35 USC § 112 rejection of that claim.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed “computer readable medium.” Applicants have amended the specification at paragraph [0014] to disclose that a computer readable medium is used in at least one embodiment. As discussed above, the examiner indicated that this amendment would not constitute new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, requesting clarification of what “the plurality of probabilities” are pertaining to, and explaining the use of a “predecessor” in calculating the probabilities.

The term “a plurality of probabilities” is intended to be read in conjunction with the following phrase, “that a user will request said content element from a content element stored in one or more other cachelines.”

In other words the probabilities are “probabilities that a user will request said content element.” Furthermore, the claim element provides that such probabilities pertain to situations where the user requests “said content element from a content element stored in one or more other cachelines.” Thus there may exist a first probability that the user will request

said content element from a content element stored cache line A, a second probability that the user will request said content element from a content element stored cache line B or more.

The term “predecessor” is used as that term is generally understood in the field of the invention, namely, to refer to a content element that precedes another content element in a clickstream. (Claims 32 and 40 contain the above language and Applicants clarifications apply to those claims also.)

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, requesting clarification of the term “component.” Applicants have amended claim 32 to disclose that the system includes a processor and that said components are “software components.” The examiner indicated that these amendments would overcome the present rejection.

Date: June 16, 2008

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439